

Remarks

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicated that listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement and that any references which have not been cited by the Examiner on the form PTO-892 have not been considered. Applicants timely filed an Information Disclosure Statement on February 13, 2006 just prior to the mailing date of the present office action and suspect that the filed information disclosure statement did not reach the Examiner in time for examination. Applicants therefore requested acknowledgment and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they do not show the "upward facing opening" as claimed in claim 12. Claim 12 was been canceled rendering the drawing objection moot.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of an informality on page 19, line 15. Accordingly, "may be cause" has been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim objections

Claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are objected to because of certain informalities. Claims 3, 4, 6 and 10 have been cancelled. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 1 rendering the objections moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner points to certain language in claims 1 and 14 reciting that the crimper and the anvil are movable toward and away from each other. Accordingly, claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite that the crimper moves toward and away from the anvil consistent with the specification. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the Examiner asserts that the specification, while being enabling for a downward facing step, does not reasonably provide enablement for an upward facing opening as claimed in claim 12. Claim 12 has been canceled and claim 13 has been amended to depend from claim 11 rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the Examiner asserts that it is unclear whether both the crimper and the anvil move, or if one of them is fixed with reference to the rest of the apparatus. Considering the amendments to claims 1 and 14 reciting that the crimper moves toward and away from the anvil, Applicants assert that these claims as amended are clear. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the Examiner asserts that it is unclear what is placed on the anvil. Claim 2 has been amended to clarify that the terminal is placed on the anvil. Reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claim 8 the Examiner asserts that it is unclear whether a second conductor is indeed inserted into the collapsible terminal. Applicants assert that claim 8 is clear in that it is

not intended to claim the second conductor but simply the terminals ability to receive the conductor. Reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claims 9 and 12 the Examiner asserts that certain phrases are unclear. Claims 9 and 12 have been cancelled rendering the rejection thereof moot. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wigby et al., (U.S. 4,272,879). The Examiner asserts that the reference teaches all the elements of these claims. Independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to add a recitation of a positioning plate and further detail of the guide member. As Wigby et al. does not teach nor suggest a positioning plate having an escape groove for allowing movement of the conductive lead during termination thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fukase, (U.S. 6,742,251). The Examiner asserts that the reference teaches all the elements of these claims. Claim 9 has been cancelled rendering the rejection thereof moot and claim 1 has been amended to recite that the guide member is linked via a link piece to a ram on which the crimper is mounted such that the guide member is caused to retreat from the elongate component upon the downward motion of the crimper, before the crimper abuts the terminal. Fukase does not teach nor suggest such a link piece linking the guide member to a ram. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 5 and 14-16 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sullivan (U.S. 3,587,158). Once again, the Examiner asserts that Sullivan teaches all the elements of these claims. Independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to add a recitation of a positioning plate. As Sullivan does not teach nor suggest a positioning plate having an escape groove for allowing movement of the conductive lead during termination thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wigby et al, in view of Fukase. Claim 10 depends ultimately from claim 1 which has been amended to add a recitation of a positioning plate and further detail of the guide member. Wigby et al. does not teach nor suggest a positioning plate having an escape groove for allowing movement of the conductive lead during termination thereof. That which Wigby et al. lacks, Fukase neither teaches nor suggests. Furthermore, Fukase lacks a teaching or suggestion of the link piece linking the guide member to a ram as required by claim 1 and discussed above. Therefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wigby et al, in view of Baldyga. Claim 12 was been canceled and claims 11 and 13 depend ultimately from claim 1 which has been amended as described above. Wigby et al. does not teach nor suggest a positioning plate having an escape groove for allowing movement of the conductive lead during termination thereof. That which Wigby et al. lacks, Baldyga neither teaches nor suggests, therefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons and in view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully contend that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 13, 14, and 16, and issuance of a Patent for the subject invention. Please charge any additional requisite fees relating to this amendment and response to Deposit Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,

Barley Snyder
Customer No. 29450

/sa/
Salvatore Anastasi
Registration No. 39090
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: (610) 722-3899
Facsimile: (610) 889-3696